



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,281	09/28/2001	Jerlyn R. Culp	10010685-1	5757

7590 06/17/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,281

Applicant(s)

CULP ET AL.

Examiner

Asad M. Nawaz

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/05.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 2, 2005. The specification was amended to overcome objections. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-13 have been directly amended. Claims 14-19 have been canceled. Claims 20-26 have been newly added. Claims 1-13 and 20-26 are pending.
2. The information disclosure statement received on March 2, 2005 has been fully considered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 20-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 20 recites the limitation "said optical imaging device" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2155

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being taught by Rasansky et al (US Patent No. 5,960,406) hereinafter referred to as Rasansky.

As to claim 1, Rasansky teaches a system for collecting calendar information from a predetermined calendar source and distributing calendar data to a subscriber, said system comprising:

an input device configured to capture calendar data from a subscriber designated calendar source; (abstract; Fig 2; col 2, lines 2-21)

a collection and distribution unit communicatively coupled to the input device and a network via a network interface, the collection and distribution unit comprising [;] a storage memory for storing a subscriber list and configured to integrate calendar data from the input device into a calendar database; and (abstract; Fig 2; col 2, lines 2-21, col 7, lines 43-67)

a subscriber unit indirectly coupled and registered with the collection and distribution unit, the subscriber unit configured to receive calendar data from the collection and distribution unit in accordance with said subscriber list. (abstract; col 2, lines 2-21, col 7, lines 43-52; col 8, lines 17-27)

As to claim 2, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said network comprises the Internet. (col 2, line 50; col 4, lines 20-27)

As to claim 3, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said network interface comprises a wireless interface. (col 4, lines 20-27)

As to claim 4, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said subscriber designated calendar source comprises a world wide web (WWW) site. (abstract; col 2, lines 22-36)

As to claim 5, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 4, wherein said world wide web site comprises a hyper-text mark-up language (HTML) compliant web site. (abstract; col 2, lines 22-36)

As to claim 6, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said collection and distribution unit accesses said subscriber designated calendar source interest and retrieves predetermined calendar information. (abstract; cols 7 and 8, lines 63-67 and 1-50)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasansky et al (US Patent No. 5,960,406) hereinafter referred to as Rasansky further in view of Williams (US Patent Number 5,761,525).

As to claim 7, Rasansky teaches system for collecting calendar information from a predetermined calendar source and distributing calendar data to a subscriber, said

Art Unit: 2155

system comprising:

an input device configured to capture calendar data from a subscriber designated calendar source; (abstract; Fig 2; col 2, lines 2-21)

a collection and distribution unit communicatively coupled to the input device and a network via a network interface, the collection and distribution unit comprising [;] a storage memory for storing a subscriber list and configured to integrate calendar data from the input device into a calendar database; and (abstract; Fig 2; col 2, lines 2-21, col 7, lines 43-67)

a subscriber unit indirectly coupled and registered with the collection and distribution unit, the subscriber unit configured to receive calendar data from the collection and distribution unit in accordance with said subscriber list. (abstract; col 2, lines 2-21, col 7, lines 43-52; col 8, lines 17-27)

However, Rasansky does not explicitly indicate the input device being an optical imaging device. Williams discloses capturing calendar information by means of an optical character recognition through the use of a scanner. (col 2, lines 47-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rasansky to incorporate the teachings of Williams to increase system usability. The addition of a scanner as an input device would allow the user of the system to more appropriately, efficiently, and easily input data to be read by the processor. (col 2, lines 60-65)

As to claim 8, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 7 wherein said collection and distribution unit distributes said calendar data to the subscriber as an e-mail attachment. (col 2, lines 38-45; col8, lines 17-27)

As to claim 9, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 7, wherein said subscriber list comprises data identifying the subscriber. (cols 7 and 8, line s63-67 and 1-50)

As to claim 10, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 9, wherein said subscriber list further comprises data identifying said calendar of data. (col 7, lines 43-52)

As to claim 11, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 10, wherein said subscriber list further comprises data identifying a predetermined format for compiling said calendar data. (col 8, lines 17-27)

As to claim 12, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 11 however does not explicitly indicate predetermined format that is compliant with IETF standards for electronic business cards. Official Notice is taken that IETF standards for business cards are well-known and widely implemented in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a format for electronic business cards into Rasansky and Williams for the purpose of converting optical character recognition data into editable format data.

As to claim 13, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 7, wherein said collection and distribution unit is further configured to synchronize calendar data. (col 4, lines 42-55)

As to claim 21, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said collection and distribution unit collects data in a first format and distributes data in a native format of the calendar database. (col 8, lines 17-27)

As to claim 21, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said subscriber unit stores the calendar database in a format other than the native format of the calendar database. (col 8, lines 17-27)

As to claim 21, Rasansky teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said subscriber unit stores the calendar database in a format retrieved from a specified calendar source. (col 8, lines 17-27)

Claims 24-26 contain similar limitations as claims 21-23 and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Amendment

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2155

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


AMN


SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER